

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-30 and 37-78 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 4, 21, 37, 40, 57, 67, and 74 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-30 and 37-78 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 30, 37-43, 45, 47-52, 54, 55, 57-59, 61, 62, 66-69, 71-75, and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,706,097 to Schelling et al. (hereinafter “Schelling”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,554 to Lowitz et al. (hereinafter “Lowitz”), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,498 to Miyake et al. (hereinafter “Miyake”). Claims 8, 17, 20, 27-29, 44, 53, 56, 63-65, 70, and 77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view of Lowitz and Miyake, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,082 to Gibbon et al. (hereinafter “Gibbon”). Claims 10 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view Lowitz, Miyake, and Gibbon, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,098,082 to Geaghan et al. (hereinafter “Geaghan”). Claims 24, 60, and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view of Lowitz, Miyake, Gibbon, and Geaghan.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 7, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 30, 37-43, 45, 47-52, 54, 55, 57-59, 61, 62, 66-69, 71-75, and 78 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Schelling, in view of Lowitz and Miyake. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Schelling with the teachings of Lowitz and Miyake.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Schelling, Lowitz, and Miyake, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 7, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 30, 37-43, 45, 47-52, 54, 55, 57-59, 61, 62, 66-69, 71-75, and 78.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of generating a printable representation for an electronically stored multimedia document storing multimedia information, the multimedia information comprising information of at least a first type and information of a second type. The method recited in claim 1 includes:

receiving input specifying a concept of interest;

analyzing the multimedia information in the multimedia document based on the input to identify information relevant to the concept of interest, the information relevant to the concept of interest comprising information of the first type and information of the second type;

accessing layout information specifying a first layout feature associated with how the information of the first type is to be arranged when printed on a paper medium and specifying a second layout feature associated with how the information of the second type is to be arranged when printed on the paper medium; and

generating the printable representation for the multimedia information stored in the multimedia document based upon the layout information, the printable representation for the multimedia document comprising a printable representation for information of the first type and

a printable representation for information of the second type, the printable representation of the multimedia document capable of being printed on a paper medium.

Applicants respectfully submit that, based on the following discussion, Schelling, Lowitz, and Miyake, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in amended claim 1. For example, amended claim 1 recites the features of “receiving input specifying a concept of interest” and “analyzing the multimedia information in the multimedia document based on the input to identify information relevant to the concept of interest, the information relevant to the concept of interest comprising information of the first type and information of the second type.”

Schelling is directed to an operator manually selecting a still-image or frame from a video sequence to represent the video sequence as stored on disk. (Schelling: Abstract; Col. 3, lines 7-9). However, Schelling does not teach or suggest the feature of “receiving input...” as recited in claim 1 because the operator in Schelling merely chooses still-images, textual or other iconic information that the operator desires to represent the data file on disk. Moreover, Schelling does not teach or suggest analyzing multimedia information based on input that has been received specifying a concept of interest as recited in claim 1 because, as discussed above, the operator in Schelling merely reviews the videos to select desired frames. The mere reviewing of the multimedia information in Schelling to select portions desired by the manual operator to represent data files on a disk does not teach or suggest that multimedia information is analyzed as recited in claim 1 based on input specifying a concept of interest to identify information relevant to the concept of interest, the information relevant to the concept of interest comprising information of the first type and information of the second type.

Lowitz is directed to an operator using a device to select a frame or sequence of frames of video to be printed on paper. (Lowitz: Abstract). Lowitz does not teach or suggest receiving input specifying a concept of interest as recited in claim 1 because the operator in Lowitz merely pushes a button to select a particular frame or sequence of frames to be printed on paper. Selecting a specific frame in Lowitz does not teach or suggest that input is received as recited in claim 1 that specifies a general topic or concept of interest.

Lowitz further fails to teach or suggest analyzing multimedia information in a multimedia document based on the input to identify information relevant to the concept of interest as recited in claim 1. The device in Lowitz merely extracts still-images or sequences of still images from a video signal based on user selection of still-images. The still-images in Lowitz are specifically selected by the user. Simply picking out specific frames from a video signal that an operator in Lowitz wants to print does not teach or suggest that multimedia information in a multimedia document is analyzed to identify information relevant to a general topic or concept of interest as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Lowitz fails to cure the deficiencies of Schelling discussed above. Both Schelling and Lowitz fail to teach or suggest, either individually or in combination, the features of receiving input specifying a concept of interest, and analyzing multimedia information in a multimedia document based on the input specifying a concept of interest to identify information relevant to the concept of interest, the information relevant to the concept of interest comprising information of the first type and information of the second type as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action merely relies on Miyake for its teachings as allegedly disclosing layout information as recited in claim 1. However, Miyake fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Schelling and Lowitz. Miyake is directed to an apparatus that discriminates between pieces of data representing an image which should be encoded or not encoded into a bitmap image for printing. (Miyake: Abstract). Thus, Miyake fails to teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of “receiving input specifying a concept of interest” and “analyzing the multimedia information in the multimedia document based on the input to identify information relevant to the concept of interest, the information relevant to the concept of interest comprising information of the first type and information of the second type.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Schelling, Lowitz, and Miyake, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

**Claim 21**

Claim 21 recites a computer-implemented method of generating a paper document for a electronically stored multimedia document, the multimedia document storing multimedia information that includes video information. The method recited in claim 21 includes:

receiving a time span associated with a page of the paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page;

printing one or more video keyframes in a first area of the page of the paper document, wherein the one or more video keyframes are extracted from the video information occurring during the time span associated with the page; and

printing text information in a second area of the page of the paper document, wherein the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page.

Applicants respectfully submit that, based on the following discussion, Schelling, Lowitz, and Miyake, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in claim 21.

Claim 21 recites, in part, receiving a time span associated with a page of the paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page. As recited above, one or more video keyframes are extracted from video information occurring during the time span associated with the page. The one or more video keyframes are printed in a first area of the page of the paper document. Text information is also printed in a second area of the page of the paper document, wherein the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page.

Schelling fails to teach or suggest receiving a time span associated with a page of the paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page. Schelling merely discloses that the operator may add other textual information relating to the file such the date and time of the recording of the data. (Schelling: Col. 3, lines 20-25). Merely placing the data and time of the recording of the data on the index print in Schelling does not teach or suggest receiving a time span associated with a page of the paper

document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Schelling fails to teach or suggest the features of “printing one or more video keyframes in a first area of the page of the paper document, wherein the one or more video keyframes are extracted from the video information occurring during the time span associated with the page” (emphasis added) and “printing text information in a second area of the page of the paper document, wherein the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page” (emphasis added).

Lowitz also fails to teach or suggest receiving a time span associated with a page of a paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page as recited in claim 1. Instead, Lowitz discloses that time code information may be added to a picture to indicate the sequential location of at least a portion of the frame within the input video stream. (Lowitz: Col. 10, lines 5-9). Thus, merely receiving time code information indicating the sequential location of at least a portion of the frame within the input video stream in Lowitz does not teach or suggest receiving a time span associated with a page of a paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Lowitz also fails to teach or suggest the features of “printing one or more video keyframes in a first area of the page of the paper document, wherein the one or more video keyframes are extracted from the video information occurring during the time span associated with the page” (emphasis added) and “printing text information in a second area of the page of the paper document, wherein the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page” (emphasis added).

The Office Action merely relies on Miyake for its teachings as allegedly disclosing layout information as recited in claim 1. However, Miyake fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Schelling and Lowitz. Miyake is directed to an apparatus that discriminates between pieces of data representing an image which should be encoded or not encoded into a bitmap image for printing. (Miyake: Abstract). Thus, Miyake fails to teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of “receiving a time span associated with a page of the

paper document, the time span characterized by a first time for the page and a second time for the page,” “printing one or more video keyframes in a first area of the page of the paper document...,” and “printing text information in a second area of the page...”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Schelling, Lowitz, and Miyake, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in claim 21. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references.

**Claims 2-30 and 37-78**

Applicants submit that independent claims 37, 57, 67, and 74 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 21, and others. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-19, 22-29, 38-56, 58-66, 68-73, and 75-78 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 21, 37, 57, 67, and 74 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 8, 17, 20, 27-29, 44, 53, 56, 63-65, 70, and 77 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Schelling, in view of Lowitz , Miyake, and Gibbon. Applicants further respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 10, 24, 46, 60, and 76 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Schelling, in view of Lowitz , Miyake, Gibbon, and Geaghan.

Appl. No. 10/001,895  
Amdt. dated March 15, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2006

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:am  
60880900 v1